UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,265	01/23/2002	Christian Lindholm	1123.41114X00	2207

20457	7590	06/01/2005

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER
TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/052,265	LINDHOLM, CHRISTIAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mylinh Tran	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 February 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 January 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 02/01/05 has been entered and carefully

considered. Claims 1-28 have been amended. Claims 35-36 have been

added. The amended claims have not been found to be patentable over

prior art of record; therefore, claims 1-36 are rejected under the new ground

of rejection as set forth below. In addition, applicant's amendment fails to

respond to the Examiner's objection to the Specification. This objection is

maintained.

Specification

On page 1, [0001], in the cross-reference to related applications section,

please fill out the blanks of filling dates of the related applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
invention was made

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Goldberg et al. [US.6,452,597] in view of Yamagishi et al. [US.

6,178338].

As to claims 1 and 25-27, Goldberg et al. discloses a computer

implemented method and corresponding apparatus for detecting a

displayed size of the application on an application user interface of a mobile

terminal device (column 2, lines 29-33, column 4, lines 52-56 and column 5,

lines 1-10); determining a number of information depending on a size of a

display of the information by the user interface of the application and fitting

the application having said displayed sized (column 4, lines 48-51 and

column 6, lines 34-48); and displaying the information within the application

on the application user interface on the display (column 4, lines 30-37).

Goldberg et al. fails to clearly teach an option list including options chosen

from a given set of options of an application on an application user

interface. However, in the same field of the invention, the claimed

limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi et al (column 4, lines 21-44). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's teaching of processing the

option lists with Goldberg's size detecting. Motivation of combining would

have been to present multiple numbers of options.

As to claim 2, Goldberg et al. also discloses a step of detecting a resolution

and/or size of said application user interface and rescaling the displayed

size of the application accordingly (column 6, line 65 through column 7, line

7).

As to claims 3-4 and 35-36, Goldberg et al. fails to clearly teach at least one

option being included in the option list, displaying all options of the given set

of options, if the at least one option is chosen. However, in the same field of

the invention, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi et al

(column 4, lines 21-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's

teaching of processing the option lists with Goldberg's size detecting.

Motivation of combining would have been to present multiple numbers of

options.

As to claims 5-7, Goldberg et al. shows a step of removing the lines of

information if the size of the display of the application decreases, so as to

adapt the amount of information to the size of the display of the display of

the application (column 6, lines 20-47).

As to claims 8-11, Goldberg et al. also shows a step of adding the lines of

information if a size of the display of application increases, so as to adapt

the amount of information to the size of the application (column 6, lines 35-

67).

As to claims 12-16, Goldberg et al. teaches amount of information adapting

dynamically if a user scales the application or the application user interface

(column 4, lines 30-62).

As to claims 17-22, Goldberg et al. also teaches the information adapting

dynamically if the user connects the mobile terminal device to at least one

of an additional display and external display (column 3, lines 54-63 and

column 5, lines 24-41).

As to claim 23, Goldberg et al. provides the menu options including context

sensitive options (column 6, lines 30-52).

As to claim 24, Goldberg et al. fails to teach the options in the option list

being ordered by their frequency of use. However, in the same field of the

invention, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi et al (column 4, lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's teaching of processing the option lists with Goldberg's size detecting. Motivation of combining would have been to better organize the options in the list.

As to claims 28-29, Goldberg et al. also teaches an access point in mobile communication for the mobile terminal device and forming part of a network (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 10).

As to claims 30-34, Goldberg et al. suggests a network and a server connected to the network and a connection from the access point or said server to the Internet (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 10).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's traverse with the taken of Official Notice of processing option lists have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at 571-272-4136.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306

and / or:

571-273-4141 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100